

IV. REMARKS

The present invention is a combined touch panel and light for use with a display. It features a combining means for calculating the position of interruption of light from the intensity of light determined by a sensor. The result is high resolution, compact size, and operation even with non-parallel light beams, if necessary.

In Graham, light sources and light detectors basically correspond one to one, and the detection means only detects if a light beam from corresponding light source on the opposite side is interrupted or not (i.e. in a digital manner). Therefore, resolution is highly dependent on the number of light sources (and detectors).

Graham does not teach how to function when the light beams are NOT parallel to each other (i.e. scattered from point light source like an LED), and each light detection means detects the intensity of light including interference between light from an adjacent light source. Further, it does not teach that the position of light interruption is calculated from the above.

In the present invention, the light may not necessarily be in a parallel beam, and may be scattered from each of the light sources (or even from one point light source), and the beams may interfere with each other. By detecting the intensity of light (i.e. in an analog manner) and calculating by the combining means, the light interruption position may be determined.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "...a combining means for calculating the position of interruption of light from the intensity of light determined by said sensor". Since this feature is not disclosed in Graham, the rejection of claims 1-10, 13 and 17 under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn. Further, since this feature is not suggested by Graham, these claims are unobvious over it.

Also, since these features are not in Kubo, combining it with Graham does not result in the present invention. Thus, the rejection of claims 14 and 18-26 on Graham in view of Kubo under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

Still further, since these features are not in Selbrede, combining it with Graham does not result in the present invention. Thus, the rejection of claims 15 and 16 on Graham on view of Selbrede under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$110 is enclosed for a one month extension. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler

Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Sept 5, 2003
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 9/5/03

Signature: Carolina Rodriguez
Person Making Deposit